RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 22 2007

REMARKS

This is a response to the office action issued by the USPTO on 17 May 2007.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-17, 19-24, 26-39, 41-46, 48-52, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 13 as being unpatentable over Carpentier et al. in view of Williams (US 6,591,272). The Examiner has asserts with respect to claim 1, 24 and 46 as being unpatentable over Carpentier et al. in view of Williams. We respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the prior art of record is analogous. The present invention is in the field of providing an indication of integrity of **an application**, rather than an indication of integrity of the data files that are used by an application.

Carpentier et al. merely teaches checking the integrity of **data files** and does not provide an indication of the integrity of applications, for example the integrity of a database and not the data therein. Therefore, Carpentier is not in same field of endeavour.

Williams provides no teaching suggestion or motivation of providing an indication of the integrity of anything. Williams merely provides a translated or standardized view of data so that multiple applications can access the translated or standardized data. The Examiner's reference to the description in Williams at col.4, lines 60-65 merely teaches that a user can select or deselect which portions of a database are to be 'standardized', or translated (col. 4, line 49). This reference in Williams is directed towards figures 12, 13 and 16 which show a graphical user interface wherein a user can select and deselect portions of a database to be translated. The 'application' referred to in the passage referenced by the Examiner is the application using the information from the database, i.e. the application that will receive the translated information (objects 38, Figure 3) on the client computer 16. Therefore, Williams is a translation or standardization system which does not provide an indication of the integrity of an application and so is not in the same field of endeavour as the present application. Indeed, Williams is not concerned about the integrity of any applications, but is only concerned with providing universally accessible data regardless of the application.

Even if the teachings of Carpentier et al. and Williams were combined, regardless of the fact there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to carry out such a combination, a combination of the features in Carpentier et al. and Williams would not provide all the features of claims 1, 24 or 46.

That is, neither of Carpentier et al. and Williams teaches or suggests **providing an indication of the integrity of an application.**

As explained above, Carpentier et al. merely determines whether a received descriptor file when hashed is the same as a unique ID within a previously received eClip. The descriptor file and eClip are distinct from any application and are not associated with the integrity of any applications. Further, Williams does not provide an indication of integrity for anything, as explained above.

Further, neither Carpentier et al. nor Williams teach or suggest **creating first and second reduced representations of schema metadata and comparing them to provide an indication of the integrity of an application.** There is clearly a difference between schema metadata, which provides metadata about a particular schema, and just metadata, which is not specific to anything. The disclosure of metadata is not a disclosure of schema metadata. Indeed one disclosure of metadata in Williams ('31' in Figure 2 and col.8, lines 15-16) is merely referring to the metadata associated with a pseudo object. For example, using the analogy at col.7, lines 52-67, the metadata would merely be proving an indication that the text of a file is to be 'bolded'. This is not schema metadata. Although Williams discusses schema with respect to databases 20a-20e, these are merely to allow different types of code to be generated using different programming languages. There is no teaching or suggestion of creating first or second reduced representations of the schema in Williams let alone comparing them.

Further, although Carpentier et al. may teach hashing of metadata within a descriptor file, this does not teach comparing first and second reduced representations of schema metadata **to provide an indication of the integrity of an application.** The hashing of the descriptor file in Carpentier et al. is merely to determine whether the received descriptor file

is what it purports to be, and, as such the status (i.e. a true or false copy) of the descriptor file is not relevant to the integrity of an application it is associated with.

The inclusion of directory information in the descriptor file of Carpentier et al. does not enable the system to provide an indication of the integrity of an application for the simple reason that the directory information is obtained and placed in the descriptor file at the same time as creating the unique ID for the eClip (col.9, lines 38-39 'A cryptographic hash binary sequence identifier for the stored descriptor file is then computed'). Therefore, the directory information that is placed in the descriptor file and the element of the unique ID that is associated with the directory information will always be identical, and as such the comparison of the unique ID and hash of the descriptor file can not provide any indication of the integrity of that directory information, let alone an application associated with the directory information.

The purpose of the present application is to allow a primary application to be controlled dependent on an indication of the integrity of a secondary application (for example, a database). The indication of integrity is provided by comparing the structure of the secondary application at two different times to determine if the structure has changed. If the structure has changed, then there is a lack of integrity, whereas if the structure hasn't changed, integrity is intact. If integrity is intact, the primary application is able to be used safe in the knowledge that, in the case of a database, data can be accurately retrieved without incompatibility issues, for example.

If Williams were to be combined with Carpentier et al., only the following two scenarios are possible.

In a first scenario, referring to Figure 2 of Williams, the hashing of codes A and B (26a, 26z in Williams) will always give different results because code A (26a) always produces a different object to code B (26z). This is because codes A and B are the translation of data for different programming languages and as such give different results. Therefore, this does not provide an indication of the integrity of an application because a result is always obtained that the codes A and B are different.

In the second scenario, referring to Figure 2 of Williams, the hashing of the schema of 20a and 20b databases will usually provide different results because the databases are unique and distinct from each other. Even if the databases are identical, this does not provide an indication of the integrity of either database but merely shows that both databases have the same structure.

The inventive step of the present invention lies in the creation of hashes of schema metadata initially using a process, and then subsequently, during execution of a primary application, using the same process. The two separately obtained hashes are then compared to check the integrity of a secondary application from where the schema metadata came. Merely because Carpentier et al. uses hashing to indicate the integrity of **contents** of a file and Williams merely uses one application to obtain schema of a secondary application, does not result in a system or method that can **compare hashes of schema metadata to check the integrity of the secondary application**. In order to do this, it would be necessary to first replace the comparison of hashes of the **contents** of data files in Carpentier et al. with the comparison of hashed schema metadata, where both Carpentier et al. and Williams are silent on comparing the hashes of schema metadata in order to provide an indication of integrity of an application (from where the schema metadata came). Further, it would be necessary to use the results of a comparison of hashes of schema metadata to provide an indication of the integrity of **the secondary application from where the schema metadata comes**, when Carpentier et al. and Williams are silent on providing an indication of the integrity of anything other than the **contents** of a data file.

With respect, we believe the Examiner is using hindsight in raising the rejections. That is, the Examiner is merely referring to two pieces of prior art that refer to certain features that the claimed invention uses in a unique way without indicating where in the prior art there is any teaching, suggestion or motivation for a skilled reader to combine the features of the prior art to produce the invention as claimed. Further, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation within the prior art that the combination of these features would provide the same advantage as provided by the combination of features in the claims. It should be noted that the claims should be read as a whole and that the features of the claims can not be proven to be obvious by merely switching references for one feature in one piece of prior art

with another feature in another piece of prior art where there is no motivation to do so, and where the resulting mismatch of features does not provide the claim as defined as a whole.

For these reasons, claims 1, 24 and 46 are considered to be novel and inventive over the prior art of record. The dependent claims are also considered to be novel and inventive when dependent on claims 1, 24 and 46.

Based on our arguments above, we trust this application is now in order for allowance.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 22 2007

CONCLUSION

Based on all these considerations and amendment, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is again urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully Submitted,
Damon Gerald van Opdorp

Date: 22 June 2007 By

Richard J. Gregson
Reg. No. 41,804

UNISYS CORPORATION
Unisys Way, MS/E8-114
Blue Bell, PA 19424
Phone: (215)986-3325
Fax: (215)986-3090